



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,481	01/27/2004	Paul Shirley	MICS:0117 (02-1051)	9550
7590 08/17/2006		EXAMINER		
Michael G. Fletcher			TOLEDO, FERNANDO L	
Fletcher Yoder P.O. Box 692289			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX 77269-2289			2823	
		DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

j,

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/765,481	SHIRLEY ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Fernando L. Toledo	2823		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	,						
Before the Filling of all Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Fernando L. Toledo	2823					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 June 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</li> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> </ol>							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no							
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
	appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
	illowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.							
<ul><li>12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. Other:</li></ul>	(P1O/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s).	1				
Fernando L. Toledo							
		Patent Examiner	•				

Art Unit 2823

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contests that the ramp-up of Wolf cannot be construed as a separate step of a two-step soft-bake. Examiner respectfully submits that the ramp up of Wolf encompases what the claims dictates which is a first soft-bake step at a predetermined temperature and time and a second bake at another temperature and time. The ramp up does read into a baking step having a temperature for a predetermined amount of time. The claim is silent in distinguishing between the ramp up and the actual first soft bake or between the ramp up and second soft bake. Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). See \*also In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. . . . The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed. . . . An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process."). Furthermore, if Applicant wants to distinguish between a ramp up and a first step soft-bake it should be clear in the claim. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Regarding claim 12, Applicant contests that Wolf does not disclose a resist without craters. Examiner repsectfully submits that the soft bake process of Wolf would eliminate creaters since, as taught by Wolf in page 434, it will anneal the stresses caused by the shear forces caused by spinning which would eliminate the creaters.